

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In the above-identified Office Action the Examiner has rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. section 112 as lacking antecedent basis for the term "the stripping container." Applicant has amended Claim 14 to eliminate this indefiniteness.

In addition, claims 12-18 have been rejected as unpatentable over Rickard in view of Jonninen. Applicant notes that it has amended the specification so that it more closely tracks the meaning in the original German so that it is now more clear that chemicals such as acids or alkylides are not required by the subject invention and thus this difference defines over the prior art which uses both acids and alkylides in the process. As support for its amendments to the specification Applicant hereby supplies page 8 of the original PCT application in German with the words "Säuren oder Laugen" underlined and which were originally translated as "acids or lyes." Applicant believes that "Laugen" is more accurately translated as "alkali" and submits pages from two online dictionaries and one print English-German dictionary showing that alkali in English may be translated as Lauge and the online dictionary shows that "Lauge" in German may be translated into English as an alkaline solution. As a result, Applicant believes this translation change is justified.

Neither reference, Rickard or Jonninen, teach the absence of these substances. In particular Rickard, in Fig. 1, shows the addition of an alkali through conduit 16 into the reactor, which is shown as having excess alkali and, thereafter, sulphuric acid is placed into the stream underneath the reactor. Thus, it can be seen that Rickard uses both alkali and acid in the treatment of its waste water. Jonninen teached the use of a sulphuric acid solution to remove ammonia (column 4, line 58). As a result, Applicant believes that with the amendments to the specification and the claims, as set forth above, that both Rickard and Jonninen are distinguished and the subject invention, as now claimed, should be patentable.

Application No. 10/579,576
Amdt. dated 8 February 2010
Reply to Office Action of 13 November 2009

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and reexamination thereof.

No further fee or petition is believed to be necessary. However, should any further fee be needed, please charge our Deposit Account No. 23-0920, and deem this paper to be the required petition.

With the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered ready for allowance and applicant earnestly solicits an early notice of same. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he/she is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below listed number.

Application No. 10/579,576
Amdt. dated 8 February 2010
Reply to Office Action of 13 November 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: 8 February 2010

Gerald T Shekleton
Reg. No. 27,466
Husch Blackwell Sanders Welsh & Katz
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 655-1511
Fax: (312) 655-1501